

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's willingness to appropriately renumber the claims as indicated in paragraph #2 of the current Office Action to account for a "missing claim 21". Accordingly, although not explicitly so indicated above for the sake of clarity, claims 22-72 as originally numbered have been renumbered as claims 21-71 as presented above. The relevant claim dependencies have likewise been adjusted as stipulated in the Office Action.

In the current Office Action, claims 1-71 were examined. Claims 1-71 were rejected.

Specifically, claims 1-71 were "rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Aharoni et al. (US 6,014,694)."

Claim 69 has been canceled, and claim 72 has been added. Of now pending claims 1-68 and 70-72, claims 1, 24, 47, 65, 68, and 72 are independent. The following remarks indicate one or more portions of each of these independent claims that are not described in Aharoni et al. (6,014,694). Thus, for at least the following reasons (A.-F.), it is respectfully submitted that these independent claims are not anticipated by Aharoni et al.

1 A. With respect to claim 1, even assuming, *arguendo*, that Aharoni et al.
2 describes associating portions of the object-based media information with a
3 plurality of different transmission priority levels as recited, no prioritization
4 information of Aharoni et al. is considered external to the "video server 18" of FIG.
5 1 nor is it transmitted therefrom.

6 Moreover, no art of record, either alone or in combination, anticipates or
7 renders obvious at least the following element(s) in conjunction with the other
8 elements of Claim 1:

9 selectively transmitting the portions of the object-based media
10 information along with the associated plurality of different
11 transmission priority levels over a network that is configured to
12 provide differential services based at least on the plurality of
13 different transmission priority levels.

25

1 B. With respect to claim 24, even assuming, *arguendo*, that Aharoni et al.
2 describes a server device configured to provide a data bitstream that includes
3 object-based media information having portions of the object-based media
4 information associated with a plurality of different transmission priority levels
5 as recited, no prioritization information of Aharoni et al. is considered external of
6 the "video server 18" nor is it transmitted therefrom.

7 Moreover, no art of record, either alone or in combination, anticipates or
8 renders obvious at least the following element(s) in conjunction with the other
9 elements of Claim 24:

10 a server device configured to provide a data bitstream that includes
11 object-based media information having portions of the object-
12 based media information associated with a plurality of different
13 transmission priority levels and that includes identifications of the
14 associated plurality of different transmission priority levels.

15
16
17 C. With respect to claim 47, even assuming, *arguendo*, that Aharoni et al.
18 describes data [...] that includes object-based media information that is
19 packetized according to different transmission priority levels as recited, there is
20 no description in Aharoni et al. of any activity within the "network 20" of FIG. 1.

21 Moreover, no art of record, either alone or in combination, anticipates or
22 renders obvious at least the following element(s) in conjunction with the other
23 elements of Claim 47:

24 receiving data at the communications node . . . [and] selectively
25 outputting from the communications node

1
2
3 D. With respect to claim 65, even assuming, *arguendo*, that the “video
4 server 18” and the “video client 22” of Aharoni et al. actually correspond to the at
5 least one server and the at least one client as recited, there is no description in
6 Aharoni et al. of any activity within the “network 20” of FIG. 1.

7 Moreover, no art of record, either alone or in combination, anticipates or
8 renders obvious at least the following element(s) in conjunction with the other
9 elements of Claim 65:

10 at least one video transmission agent (VTA) coupled to receive the
11 prioritized object-based data packets from the server device and
12 the control requests from the client device, and to selectively
13 output at least a portion of the received prioritized object-based
14 data packets to the client device based in response to the control
15 requests.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 E. With respect to claim 68, even assuming, *arguendo*, that Aharoni et al.
2 describes video bject that has been classified as having a specific transmission
3 priority level based on at least one type of object-based video information as
4 recited, no prioritization information of Aharoni et al. is considered external of the
5 "video server 18" nor is it transmitted therefrom nor is it included in any
6 transmission packet.

7 Moreover, no art of record, either alone or in combination, anticipates or
8 renders obvious at least the following element(s) in conjunction with the other
9 elements of Claim 68:

10 a third field comprising a network packet header and containing
11 identifying data associated with the specific transmission priority
12 level of the data in the second field.

13
14
15 F. With respect to claim 72, it is respectfully submitted that Aharoni et al.
16 does not describe shape information or texture information as recited.

17 Moreover, no art of record, either alone or in combination, anticipates or
18 renders obvious at least the following element(s) in conjunction with the other
19 elements of Claim 72:

20 associating portions of the object-based media information with a
21 plurality of different transmission priority levels based, at least
22 in part, on whether a given portion of the object-based media
23 information comprises shape information or texture
24 information.

1 Reasons for the allowability of independent claims 1, 24, 47, 65, 68, and 72
2 have been provided above. Claims 2-23/70, 25-46, 48-64/71, and 66-67 depend
3 directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 24, 47, and 65, respectively.
4 Although each also includes additional element(s) militating toward allowability,
5 these dependent claims are allowable at least for the reasons given above in
6 connection with their respective independent claims.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all of pending claims 1-68 and 70-72 are allowable, and prompt action to that end is hereby requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 5/31/2004

By: Keith W. Saunders

Keith W. Saunders
Reg. No. 41,462
(509) 324-9256 ext. 238